

REMARKS

Applicants appreciate the Examiner's thorough consideration provided the present application. Claims 1, 6, 7 and 14 are now present in the application. Claim 1 has been amended. Claims 2-5, 8-13 and 15 have been cancelled. Claim 1 is independent. Reconsideration of this application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

Reasons For Entry Of Amendments

As discussed in greater detail hereinafter, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 and 103 are improper and should immediately be withdrawn. Accordingly, the finality of the Final Office Action mailed on May 17, 2007 should be withdrawn.

In addition, the amendments to claim 1 are simply made to incorporate the previously presented claims 2, 4 and 15. Therefore, no new issue is raised. In accordance with the requirements of 37 C.F.R. § 1.116, Applicants respectfully request entry and consideration of the foregoing amendments as they remove issues for appeal.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 & 103

Claims 8-11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Wu, U.S. Patent No. 7,047,348. Claims 1, 2, 4, 7, 14 and 15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wu in view of Cypress's articles. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

In light of the foregoing amendments, Applicants respectfully submit that these rejections have been obviated and/or rendered moot. As the Examiner will note, independent claim 1 has been amended to incorporate the subject matter of claims 2, 4 and 15. Applicants respectfully submit that the above combination of steps as set forth in independent claim 1 is not disclosed nor suggested by the references relied on by the Examiner.

Applicants respectfully submit that it is not obvious to one in the art at the time of the invention to use the interface of Cypress in the system of Wu. In particular, Cypress introduces the underlying architecture of the EZ-USB[®] FX2[™]. However, what Cypress teaches is merely the architecture of the EZ-USB[®] FX2[™], not how to apply the EZ-USB[®] FX2[™] into the system of Wu. EZ-USB[®] FX2[™] is one of the hardware for a person in the art to utilize. EZ-USB[®] FX2[™] is not the only hardware to be applied in the present application. EZ-USB[®] FX2[™] is coincidentally chosen by Applicants to be one embodiment to implement the present invention. As the Examiner points out in the outstanding Final Office Action, there are a lot of features which Wu does not teach; e.g., the features mentioned in 2nd paragraph on page 5, last paragraph on page 9, and from page 10, line 14 to page 11, line 9 of the outstanding Final Office Action. Those features are part of what Applicants invent. In the history of any invention, the inventor firstly figures out what functions the invention needs and then finds out what hardware may meet the requirements of the functions. That's why EZ-USB[®] FX2[™] is chosen by Applicants to be one embodiment of the present application. The Examiner's use of the datasheet (Cypress) of EZ-USB[®] FX2[™] to reject the present application is not adequate and cannot prove that the combination of Wang and Cypress is obvious. EZ-USB[®] FX2[™] inevitably possesses the

requirements of the functions as explained above. However, neither Wang nor Cypress teaches utilizing EZ-USB[®] FX2[™] to achieve the application. After all, this is simply an impermissible hindsight simply using Applicants own disclosure as a blueprint against Applicants' invention.

Accordingly, neither of the references utilized by the Examiner individually or in combination teaches or suggests the limitations of independent claim 1 or its dependent claims. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 1 and its dependent claims clearly define over the teachings of the references relied on by the Examiner.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 & 103 are respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

Since the remaining patents cited by the Examiner have not been utilized to reject the claims, but merely to show the state of the prior art, no further comments are necessary with respect thereto.

It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the Office Action, and that as such, the Examiner is respectfully requested to send the application to Issue.

In the event there are any matters remaining in this application, the Examiner is invited to contact Joe McKinney Muncy, Registration No. 32,334 at (703) 205-8000 in the Washington, D.C. area.

Application No.: 10/798,394
Amendment dated August 16, 2007
Reply to Office Action of May 17, 2007

Docket No.: 3313-1131P

Page 8 of 8

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: August 16, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Joe McKinney Muncy

Registration No.: 32,334

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

8110 Gatehouse Road

Suite 100 East

P.O. Box 747

Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747

(703) 205-8000

Attorney for Applicants

